

**Compliance Monitoring
Eastern Washington
2010
Field Forms**

Pre-survey checklist (For Office and Planning Use)

- | | |
|---------------|---|
| Form 1 | Post Survey Evaluation Form |
| Form 2 | Roads |
| Form 3 | Salvage |
| Form 4 | S or F RMZ No Outer Zone harvest |
| Form 5 | S or F RMZ No Inner Zone Harvest |
| Form 6 | Type F or S, Inner Zone Harvest, All Habitat Types |
| Form 7 | Np and Ns Streams |
| Form 8 | Type A or B Wetland Management Zones and Forested Wetlands |

Supplemental Water Information Form

This Page Left Intentionally Blank

Eastern Washington Pre-Survey Checklist (Optional for Office and Planning Use)

FPA #:	Date:	Ownership: SFLO / Industrial		
DNR Survey Lead:	DOE Survey Rep:	WDFW Survey Rep:	Tribal Representative:	Landowner representative:
Other Attendees: Representing:	Other Attendees: Representing:			

Use separate forms if needed for multiple activities

Forms to Be Completed: (As reported on FPA)

Post survey evaluation Form – Form #1 ☒ (always needed)

Road Activities

- _____ Road Construction – Form #2
- _____ Road Abandonment – Form #2
- _____ Landings – Form #2
- _____ Crossings - Form #2
- _____ Fords on N Waters --Form #2

RMZ

- _____ Salvage Harvest Form – #3
- _____ No Outer Zone Harvest– Form #4
- _____ No Inner Zone Harvest- Form #5
- _____ S or F Inner Zone Harvest all Habitat types-Form #6
- _____ Np and Ns Streams – Form #7
- _____ Wetlands - Form #8
- _____ Supplemental Water Information Form

Pre-Survey Information: (As reported on FPA)

Are there any stream type modification forms for this application? _____

Type S or F RMZ—

Stream Segment Identifier or Location _____ Within BTO: YES _____ NO _____

Harvest in Inner Zone: Y / N Zone Requirements: _____ Inner Zone Width _____ Outer Zone Width _____

Site Class on FPA/N: _____ I / II / III / IV / V Site Class on FPARS: I / II / III / IV / V

(Bring map to field for reference)

Stream Width on FPA: >15 ft / ≤15 ft _____ Stream Length: _____ ft

Core Zone Basal Area: _____ ft²/acre Dominant Species: _____

Option 1 Max dbh for thin: _____" dbh Outer Zone Basal Area Credit for: CMZ / LWD

(High Elevation Habitat type only)

Harvest planned < 75' from BFW? No _____ Yes _____ (Y= shade documentation required)

Eastern Washington Pre-Survey Checklist (Cont'd)

Outer Zone Placement Strategy: Dispersed / Clumped Sensitive Area / Clumped

Alternate Plan map included? _____ Alternate Plan ID Team Notes Included? _____

Type Np RMZ

Harvest strategy identified on FPA for Np RMZ: No harvest _____ Partial Cut _____ ClearCut _____

Stream Segment Identifier or Location _____

Harvest within 50' of bfw: Yes / No Length of Np Water: _____ ft

Water Type Modification info on FPA: Y / N

Sensitive Features: 50' _____ Headwall Seep _____ Side-slope Seep _____ Alluvial Fan
 50' _____ 2 or More Np _____ PIP/UMPPF _____ Headwall Spring

Type Ns ELZ

Stream Segment Identifier or Location _____

Road Activities

(Maps from FPA should be brought on survey to guide analysis)

Total Length of New Road Construction on FPA: _____ ft

Water Crossings: Bridge / Culvert / Temp Bridge / Temp Culvert / Ford

Proximity of Road Work to Typed Water: In or Over / Potential to Deliver / No Potential to Deliver

Number of Landings: _____

Pre-Survey Comments or Communications:

Eastern Washington Form #1 Post Survey Evaluation

FPA #	Ownership: SFL / Industrial	Time Spent:	Terrain: 0% - 30 / 31% - 50%/ >51%	Vegetation: Open / Brushy/ Very Brushy/ blowdown
Date				
DNR Survey Lead:	DOE Survey Rep:	WDFW Survey Rep:	Other Attendees: Representing:	Other Attendees: Representing:
Other Attendees: Representing:	Other Attendees: Representing:	Other Attendees: Representing:	Other Attendees: Representing:	Other Attendees: Representing:

Evaluation: Please fill out this section for each activity that was evaluated on the FPA. The form number corresponds to the question numbers on this form

1. Did information on the FPA provide adequate means to evaluate the activities completed on the ground?
(Was all information included on FPARS or was additional documentation required? Were activities accurately described? Were all exchanges, management options and deviations outlined? Were all streams and wetlands types verified, verification documented and features labeled on activity map as required?)

2. Roads (Form #2)

Status of Compliance:

With FPA_____

With Rules_____

Compliance / Non-Compliance Level:
(use professional judgment)

Exceeds

**Minor/Low
Major/High**

Medium

No Consensus

No Potential

Compliance Monitoring
Eastern Washington Post Survey Evaluation – Form #1 (Cont'd)

3. Salvage Harvest (Form #3)

Status of Compliance: With FPA _____ With Rules _____

Compliance / Non-Compliance Level: Exceeds Minor/Low Medium
(use professional judgment) Major/High No Consensus

4. No Outer Zone Harvest (Form #4)(RMZ must have an outer zone)

Status of Compliance: With FPA _____ With Rules _____

Compliance / Non-Compliance Level: Exceeds Minor/Low Medium
(use professional judgment) Major/High No Consensus

5. No Inner Zone Harvest (Form #5)

Status of Compliance: With FPA _____ With Rules _____

Compliance / Non-Compliance Level: Exceeds Minor/Low Medium
(use professional judgment) Major/High No Consensus

6. Type F or S, Inner Zone Harvest, All Habitat Types (Form #6)

Status of Compliance: With FPA _____ With Rules _____

Compliance / Non-Compliance Level: Exceeds Minor/Low Medium
(use professional judgment) Major/High No Consensus

**Compliance Monitoring
Eastern Washington Post Survey Evaluation – Form #1 (Cont'd)**

7. Np RMZ (Form #7)

Status of Compliance:		With FPA ____	With Rules ____
Compliance / Non-Compliance Level: (use professional judgment)	Exceeds	Minor/Low Major/High	Medium No Consensus
<hr/>			
<hr/>			
<hr/>			

7. Ns ELZ (Form #7)

Status of Compliance:		With FPA ____	With Rules ____
Compliance / Non-Compliance Level: (use professional judgment)	Exceeds	Minor/Low Major/High	Medium No Consensus
<hr/>			
<hr/>			
<hr/>			

8. Type A Wetland Management Zones (Form #8)

Status of Compliance:		With FPA ____	With Rules ____
Compliance / Non-Compliance Level: (use professional judgment)	Exceeds	Minor/Low Major/High	Medium No Consensus
<hr/>			
<hr/>			
<hr/>			

**Eastern Washington
Roads Form #2**

FPA # _____ Date: _____

Y= Yes, N=No, NA = Not applicable, NC =No consensus (Defer to FPF),IND=Indeterminate

General Questions

- | | |
|---|-----------------|
| 1. Were roads outsloped, insloped, crowned, ditched or bermed to prevent sediment delivery? | Y / N / NA / NC |
| 2. Were erodible soils disturbed during construction stabilized to prevent the potential to deliver to typed waters? | Y / N / NA / NC |
| 3. Were drainage structures installed at locations of seeps and springs to route water under the road prism to the forest floor to maintain hydrologic connectivity? | Y / N / NA / NC |
| 4. Was all diverted water returned to the basin from which it came? | Y / N / NA / NC |
| 5. Were cross drains, sediment traps, ditchouts, water bars, or other Best Management Practices utilized to prevent sediment delivery? | Y / N / NA / NC |
| 6. Were all relief structures \geq 15 inches in diameter? | Y / N / NA / NC |
| 7. Do relief structures effectively capture and pass ditch-line flow? | Y / N / NA / NC |
| 8. Were diversion structures placed close enough to streams to divert most sediment to the forest floor? | Y / N / NA / NC |
| 9. When water was routed to erodible soils, were relief culverts appropriately armored and/or vegetated to minimize scour? | Y / N / NA / NC |
| 10. Where the potential for sediment delivery existed, was full bench construction utilized for roads built on slopes greater than 60%? | Y / N / NA / NC |
| 11. If road construction produced end haul materials, were they placed in stable areas to prohibit the entry of material into the 100-year flood plain? | Y / N / NA / NC |
| 12. Were rock armor headwalls and rock armored ditchblocks installed for drainage structure culverts located on erodible soils where the road has a gradient greater than 6%? | Y / N / NA / NC |

Stream Crossings

- | | |
|---|-----------------|
| 13. Does new road construction minimize stream crossings? | Y / N / NA / NC |
| 14. Were alterations to the stream bed, bank and bank vegetation limited to that necessary for construction of the project? | Y / N / NA / NC |

Eastern Washington Roads Form #2(Cont'd)

- | | |
|---|-----------------|
| 15. Do roads run across typed water at a right angle? | Y / N / NA / NC |
| 16. Were culverts located and designed to minimize sediment delivery at stream crossings? | Y / N / NA / NC |
| 17. Are the locations and types of all stream crossings shown on the FPA? | Y / N / NA / NC |
| 18. Was water typed correctly on all waters using either physical criteria or a water type change? (<i>If no complete SWIF</i>) | Y / N / NA / NC |

Permanent Type N Crossings:

- | | |
|---|-----------------|
| 19. Are the alignment and slope of all culverts on grade with the natural streambed? | Y / N / NA / NC |
| 20. Are all culverts at least 24 inch dia. for Type Np waters and 15 inch dia. for Ns waters? | Y / N / NA / NC |
| 21. Do the entrances to all culverts have adequate catch basins and headwalls to minimize the possibility of erosion or fill failure? | Y / N / NA / NC |
| 22. Do the culverts, embankments and fills have erosion protection to withstand a 100-year flood? | Y / N / NA / NC |
| 23. Was slash or debris that reasonably may be expected to plug the culvert cleared for a distance of 50 feet above the culvert? | Y / N / NA / NC |
| 24. Did the culvert installation prevent scouring of the stream bed and erosion of the banks in the vicinity of the project? | Y / N / NA / NC |

Temporary Type N Crossings:

- | | |
|---|-----------------------|
| 25. Were crossings installed and removed between spring runoff completion and October 15 unless otherwise conditioned in the FPA? | Y / N / NA / NC / IND |
| 26. Is there a written plan for the abandonment and restoration of wetland crossings? | Y / N / NA / NC |
| 27. Was the crossing designed to pass the highest peak flow event expected to occur during the length of time of its use? | Y / N / NA / NC |

Type N Fords

- | | |
|---|-----------------|
| 28. Does the ford, its embankments and fills have erosion protection to withstand a 100-year flood? | Y / N / NA / NC |
| 29. Is the alignment and slope of the ford on grade with the natural flow of the streambed? | Y / N / NA / NC |

Eastern Washington Roads Form #2 (Cont'd)

30. Are entry and exit points for each ford located as close to perpendicular to the stream as possible? *(Not running adjacent or parallel)* Y / N / NA / NC

31. Are entry and exit points for each ford within 100 feet upstream or downstream of each other? Y / N / NA / NC

Bogs and Wetlands

32. Were all bogs or low nutrient fens completely avoided? Y / N / NA / NC

33. Was there any road construction in a wetland? Y / N / NA / NC

34. If #19 is yes, was the road prism and road length minimized in the wetland? Y / N / NA / NC

35. If #19 is yes, and if > .5 acre of a wetland were filled or drained due to activities, was the required replacement by substitution or enhancement completed? Y / N / NA / NC

Temporary Roads

36. Was the road designed and permitted to be temporary? Y / N / NA / NC

37. Was the road constructed in a manner to facilitate closure and abandonment when the intended use is completed? Y / N / NA / NC

38. Did the road design and culverts provide the same level of protection for public resources as required by the rules during the length of its use? Y / N / NA / NC

Road Abandonment

39. Was the road blocked so that four-wheel highway vehicles cannot pass the point of closure at the time of abandonment? Y / N / NA / NC

40. Were roads out-sloped, water barred, or otherwise left in a condition suitable to control erosion and maintain water movement within wetlands and natural drainages? Y / N / NA / NC

41. Were ditches left in a suitable condition to reduce erosion? Y / N / NA / NC

42. Were water crossing structures and fills on all typed waters removed, except where the department has determined other measures would provide adequate protection to public resources? Y / N / NA / NC

43. Was the road abandonment date identified on the FPA? Y / N / NA / NC

Eastern Washington Roads Form#2(Cont'd)

44. Was the road abandonment completed by the date indicated? Y / N / NA / NC

45. Was the road abandonment completed by the date of this field review? Y / N / NA / NC

Landings

46. Were truck roads, skid trails, and fire trails outsloped or cross drained uphill from landings and the water diverted to the forest floor away from the toe of the landing? Y / N / NA / NC

47. Are there any spoils located within the boundaries of Type A or B wetlands, or within the boundaries of a forested wetland without written approval of the department? Y / N / NA / NC

48. Was the sidecast or fill used for the landing no larger than reasonably necessary for safe operations? Y / N / NA / NC

49. Were appropriate efforts made to direct drainage away from the landing to minimize water accumulation on the landing? Y / N / NA / NC

50. Was the landing sloped to keep water from collecting on the operational surface? Y / N / NA / NC

51. Where there was a high potential for excavated materials to enter a WMZ, the bankfull width of any stream, or the 100-year floodplain, did the landowner endhaul the materials? Y / N / NA / NC

52. Was the location of the landing outside of natural drainage channels, CMZs, RMZs, Type A or B wetlands and WMZs and forested wetlands? Y / N / NA / NC

53. Are there any piles of debris that are perched and pose a risk of delivering to typed waters? Y / N / NA / NC

Compliance with the FPA and the Rules

54. Was the road activity in compliance with the approved application? Y / N / NA / NC

55. Was the road activity in compliance with the rules? Y / N / NA / NC

Comments and field observations (reasons for any out of compliance calls)

Signature _____ **Date** _____

Eastern Washington Form #3

Salvage Harvest

FPA # _____ Date: _____

Y= Yes, N=No, NA = Not applicable, NC =No consensus (Defer to FPF)

FOREST HABITAT TYPE: PP___ MC___ HE___

1. Is there any salvage within the BFW, Core Zone, or CMZ of typed water, including any portion of those trees that may have fallen outside of these zones? Y / N / NA / NC

Salvage in the Outer Zone:

2. Did the landowner receive Outer Zone leave credits for a LWD placement strategy? Y / N / NA / NC
3. Did the landowner leave the correct # of dominant and co-dominant TPA for the applicable forest habitat type in the outer zone? Y / N / NA / NC
4. Does the residual stand meet the leave tree requirements including down trees that originated from the Outer Zone? Y / N / NA / NC

Salvage in the Inner Zone:

5. Was the salvage operation conducted to protect residual undamaged trees within the Inner Zone? Y / N / NA / NC
6. If no Inner Zone salvage was proposed, is there any salvage within the Inner Zone, including any portion of those trees that my have fallen outside of it? Y / N / NA / NC
7. Did the landowner leave the correct # of dominant and co-dominant trees per acre for the applicable forest habitat type in the inner zone? Y / N / NA / NC
8. Does the residual stand meet stand requirements including down trees that originated from the Inner Zone? Y / N / NA / NC
9. If the proposed salvage involves down wood, was the correct amount for the applicable forest habitat type left in the Inner Zone after salvage? Y / N / NA / NC

For Ponderosa Pine, at least 12 tons per acre as follow:

6 pieces greater than 16 inches diameter and 20 feet in length

4 pieces greater than 6 inches in diameter and 20 feet in length

For Mixed Conifer;

At least 20 tons per acre as follow:

8 pieces greater than 16 inches diameter and 20 feet in length

8 pieces greater than 6 inches in diameter and 20 feet in length

For high Elevation;

At least 30 tons per acre as follow:

8 pieces greater than 16 inches diameter and 20 feet in length

8 pieces greater than 6 inches in diameter and 20 feet in length

Continue to next page

P 1/2

Eastern Washington Form #3 (Cont'd)

Compliance with FPA and with the Rules

10. Was the harvest in compliance with the approved application? Y / N / NA / NC

11. Was the harvest in compliance with the rules? Y / N / NA / NC

Attach any photo documentation to this form or send labeled photos with date, FPA #, and description to DNR compliance monitoring program manager. (jpgs are okay as long as descriptions are attached.)

Comments and field observations (reasons for any out of compliance calls, tree counts, etc)

Signature _____ **Date** _____

Eastern Washington Form #4
S or F RMZ No Outer Zone Harvest
FPA # _____ Date: _____

Y= Yes, N=No, NA = Not applicable, NC =No consensus (Defer to FPF)

FOREST HABITAT TYPE: PP___ MC___ HE___

- | | |
|--|------------------|
| 1. Was there any harvest in the Core Zone? | Y / N / NC |
| 2. Was there any harvest in the Inner Zone? | Y / N / NC |
| 3. Was there any harvest in the Outer Zone? | Y / N / NC |
| 4. Is the site class on FPA consistent with DNR site class maps? | Y / N / NC / IND |
| 5. Was the stream size reported on FPA consistent with the field observation?
(If no, complete SWIF) | Y / N / NA / NC |
| 6. If no did the difference affect the buffer width? | Y / N / NA / NC |
| 7. If there was harvest within 75 feet of BFW, was the required shade documentation included with the FPA? | Y / N / NA / NC |
| 8. Were unstable slopes with the potential to deliver bounded out of the sale? | Y / N / NA / NC |
| 9. Was there a regulatory CMZ that was not reported on the FPA? | Y / N / NA / NC |

Compliance with FPA and with the Rules

- | | |
|--|-----------------|
| 10. Was the harvest in compliance with the approved application? | Y / N / NA / NC |
| 11. Was the harvest in compliance with the rules? | Y / N / NA / NC |

Attach any photo documentation to this form or send labeled photos with date, FPA #, and description to DNR compliance monitoring program manager.(jpgs are okay as long as descriptions are attached.)

Comments and field observations (reasons for any out of compliance calls, tree counts, etc)

Signature _____ **Date** _____

This Page Left Intentionally Blank

Eastern Washington Form #5
S or F RMZ No Inner Zone Harvest

FPA # _____

Date: _____

FOREST HABITAT TYPE: **PP**___ **MC**___ **HE**___

- | | |
|---|------------------|
| 1. Was there any harvest in the Core Zone? | Y / N / NC |
| 2. Was there any harvest in the Inner Zone? | Y / N / NC |
| 3. Is the site class on FPA consistent with DNR site class maps? | Y / N / NC / IND |
| 4. Was the stream size reported on FPA consistent with the field observation?
(If no, complete SWIF) | Y / N / NA / NC |
| 5. If no did the difference affect the buffer width? | Y / N / NA / NC |
| 6. If there was harvest within 75 feet of BFW, was the required shade documentation
included with the FPA? | Y / N / NA / NC |
| 7. Were unstable slopes with the potential to deliver bounded out of the sale? | Y / N / NA / NC |
| 8. Was there a regulatory CMZ that was not reported on the FPA?
(If yes, complete SWIF) | Y / N / NA / NC |
-

OUTER ZONE LEAVE TREES

- | | |
|--|-----------------|
| 9. Did the landowner leave the correct # of dominant and co-dominant TPA
in the outer zone for the applicable forest habitat type and chosen outer zone strategy? | Y / N / NA / NC |
| 10. Was the harvest in compliance with the rules? | Y / N / NA / NC |
| 11. Was the harvest in compliance with the approved application? | Y / N / NA / NC |
-

Attach any photo documentation to this form or send labeled photos with date, FPA #, and description to DNR compliance monitoring program manager.(jpgs are okay as long as descriptions are attached.)

Comments and field observations (reasons for any out of compliance calls, tree counts, etc)

This page left intentionally blank

Eastern Washington Form #6
S or F RMZ
Inner Zone Harvest (All Habitat types)

FPA # _____ **Date:** _____

Y= Yes, N=No, NA = Not applicable, NC =No consensus (Defer to FPF)

FOREST HABITAT TYPE: PP___ MC___ HE___

1. Was there any harvest within the 30-foot Core Zone? Y / N / NA / NC
2. Was the stream size reported on FPA consistent with the field observation?
(If no; complete SWIF) Y / N / NA / NC
3. Is the site class on FPA consistent with DNR site class maps? Y / N / NC / IND
4. If no, did the discrepancy influence the Inner Zone width?
(Should the stream be >15 ft bfw or ≤ 15 ft bfw?) Y / N / NA / NC
5. Was there harvest within the 75- foot buffer? Y / N / NC
If No, skip to question 8.
If Yes, go to question 5.
6. If the application is within the Bull Trout Overlay, was there a documented approved strategy included in the FPA showing that all available shade would be left after harvest? Y / N / NA / NC
7. If the application is not within the Bull Trout Overlay, did the landowner demonstrate that the required shade, as determined using section 1 of the board manual, would be left following harvest? Y / N / NA / NC

Inner Zone harvest:

Stands with high basal area (answer questions 8–13):

8. Did the harvest leave at least 50 TPA and a minimum leave tree BAPA appropriate for the forest Habitat type and site index? Y / N / NA / NC

Ponderosa Pine 60 sq ft
Mixed Conifer low site index 70 sq ft
Mixed Conifer medium site index 90 sq ft
Mixed Conifer high site 110 sq ft
High Elevation see board manual Section 7 Appendix D, or DFC printout.
9. Were the 21 largest TPA left? Y / N / NA / NC

Continue to next page

P 1/4

Eastern Washington Form #6 (Cont'd)

10. Were there an additional 29 TPA that are 10 inch dbh or greater? Y / N / NA / NC
11. If there were more than 29 10-inch dbh or greater TPA, were they left in the following priority order? Y / N / NA / NC
- Trees that provide shade to water;
 - Trees that lean towards the water;
 - Trees of preferred species (see WAC 222-16-010);
 - Trees that are evenly distributed across the Inner Zone
12. Were additional trees of at least 6 inches dbh left if more than 50 TPA were needed to reach the appropriate BAPA? Y / N / NA / NC
13. If the minimum BAPA couldn't be met with less than 100 TPA of at least 6 inches dbh, were the largest trees left up to 100 TPA? Y / N / NA / NC

Stands with low basal area and high density (answer questions 14-17):

14. Did harvest leave the minimum TPA for the forest Habitat type? (100 for PP, 120 for MC) Y / N / NA / NC
15. Did the trees that were left include the 50 largest TPA? Y / N / NA / NC
16. If yes to #14, were additional trees greater than 6" dbh left to reach the minimum? Y / N / NA / NC
17. If there were not enough trees 6 inch dbh or greater per acre, were all trees ≥ 6 inch dbh left plus the largest remaining trees to reach the minimum TPA? Y / N / NA / NC

Outer Zone harvest:

18. Did the landowner leave the correct # of dominant and co-dominant TPA in the outer zone for the applicable forest habitat type and chosen outer zone strategy? Y / N / NA / NC

Stream adjacent parallel road in the Inner Zone: If no stream adjacent parallel road skip to 30 & 31.

19. Can the minimum required basal area for the habitat type be met with the presence of the road? If yes, skip to questions 30-31. If no, continue to question 21. Y / N
20. Was there harvest in the Inner Zone, including trees on the uphill side of the road? Y / N / NA / NC
21. Is the stream greater than 15 feet BFW? Y / N / NA / NC
If yes, continue to question 22. If no, go to question 26.

P 2/4, Continue to next page

Eastern Washington Form #6 (Cont'd)

Streams greater than 15 feet BFW:

22. Is the road edge that is closest to the stream 75 feet or more from the outer edge of BFW or CMZ? Y / N
If yes, skip to questions 30 & 31.
If no (therefore, the road edge is less than 75 from BFW/CMZ), answer questions 23-25.
23. Were additional leave trees, equal in total basal area to the trees lacking due to the road, left near the streams in or adjacent to the harvested unit? Y / N / NA / NC
24. If no or not applicable to the above question, did the DNR determine that additional leave trees were not available or practical to be left? Documentation from the DNR should be in the FPA. Y / N / NA / NC
25. If yes to the above question, did the landowner(s) or operator(s) employ site specific management activities to replace lost riparian functions (i.e. LWD placement in streams)? This strategy should be documented in the FPA. Y / N / NA / NC

Streams \leq 15 feet BFW:

26. Is the road edge that is closest to the stream 50 feet or more from the outer edge of BFW or CMZ? Y / N
If yes, skip to questions 30 & 31.
If no (therefore, the road edge is less than 50 from BFW/CMZ), answer questions 27-29.
27. Were additional leave trees, equal in total basal area to the trees lacking due to the Road, left near the streams in or adjacent to the harvested unit? Y / N / NA / NC
28. If no or not applicable to the above question, did the DNR determine that additional leave trees were not available or practical to be left? Documentation from the DNR should be in the FPA. Y / N / NA / NC
29. If yes to the above question, did the landowner(s) or operator(s) employ site specific management activities to replace lost riparian functions (i.e. LWD placement in streams)? This strategy should be documented in the FPA. Y / N / NA / NC

P3 /4, Continue to next page

Compliance with FPA and with the Rules:

Y / N / NA / NC

Y / N / NA / NC

Comments and field observations (reasons for any out of compliance calls, tree counts, etc)

Signature: _____ **Date** _____

Eastern Washington Form #7

Np & Ns Streams

FPA # _____ **Date:** _____

Y= Yes, N=No, NA = Not applicable, NC =No consensus (Defer to FPF)

Is this an Ns or Np stream? Ns _____ Np _____ or both _____ ?

This FPA included: Ns _____; Np _____; N (undesignated) _____; U _____; X ed out _____

If any undesignated N, U, or X ed out streams on FPA fill out SWIF comment section.

Water type: Use note templates and measurement protocols to gather information on BFW and gradient over a segment of at least 500 feet as per WAC 222-16-031(6) (f). Provide any information regarding typing information provided by LO, uncertainties, or possible questions on stream typing. Fill out SWIF for any segments in this section if needed.

1. Is the Ns stream consistent with the type reported on the FPA? **Y / N / IND / NC / NA**
(If no complete SWIF)

2. Is the Np stream consistent with the type reported on the FPA? **Y / N / IND / NC / NA**
(If no complete SWIF)

30-foot Equipment Limitation Zone (Ns and harvested portions of Np):

3. Is there evidence of equipment entry into the 30 ft ELZ? **Y / N / NC**
(A Yes answer does not necessarily indicate non-compliance)

4. Was less than 10% of the soil within the ELZ exposed due to activities? **Y / N / NA / NC**

5. If >10% of soil was exposed, were mitigation measures completed? **Y / N / NA / NC**

Np Water RMZ: Was Np RMZ harvest P/C _____ C/C _____ No Cut _____

6. Was all harvest at least 50 feet away from alluvial fans? **Y / N / NA / NC**

7. Was all harvest greater than 50 feet from headwall seeps and springs? **Y / N / NA / NC**

8. Was all harvest greater than 50 feet from all PIP/UMPPF, and the confluence of two or more Type Np streams? **Y / N / NA / NC**

What is the acreage of the RMZ? (RMZ length X 50/43560) _____ acres

9. Were the largest 10 TPA retained? **Y / N / NA / NC**
(inclusive of those that contributed to BA)

10. Were up to 40 additional TPA $\geq 10''$ dbh retained as needed to reach required BAPA? **Y / N / NA / NC**

11. If needed were up to 50 additional TPA $> 6''$ dbh left? **Y / N / NA / NC**

Continue to next page, P 1/3

Eastern Washington Form #7 (Cont'd)

- | | |
|---|----------------|
| 12. Was an equal distance no-cut buffer designated and retained by the landowner? | Y / N / NA /NC |
| 13. Was the clear-cut RMZ less than 300 ft in length? | Y / N / NA /NC |
| 14. Was $\geq 70\%$ of this reach in the unit retained as a no-cut or partial cut RMZ? | Y / N / NA /NC |
| 15. Was clear-cut RMZ greater than 500 ft from all Type F or S water? | Y / N / NA /NC |
| 16. Was the clear-cut RMZ greater than 50 ft from all headwall seeps, side slope seeps, headwater springs, alluvial fans and/or intersections of 2 or more Np waters? | Y / N / NA /NC |

Stream adjacent parallel roads Np streams.

- | | |
|--|----------------|
| 17. For roads within 30 to 49 feet of the stream, was there a 100 foot RMZ if harvesting both sides of the stream or 50-foot RMZ if harvesting on only one side of the stream? | Y / N / NA /NC |
| 18. For the requirement in #15, was the RMZ based on the following priority order? <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Preferred: The area between the stream and the stream side edge of the road.• The area that provides the most shade to the channel.• The area that is most likely to deliver large woody debris to the channel. | Y / N / NA /NC |
| 19. For roads within 30 feet of BFW of the stream, in addition to #15 and #16, were all trees left between the stream and the streamside edge of the road? | Y / N / NA /NC |

For no harvest within the RMZ, answer the following question:

- | | |
|---|----------------|
| 20. Were any trees cut inside the no cut RMZ? | Y / N / NA /NC |
|---|----------------|

Salvage

- | | |
|--|-----------------|
| 21. Was there salvage of the RMZ of any Type Np stream, or sensitive site? | Y / N / NA / NC |
| 22. Is there any salvage within the BFW of any Type N water? | Y / N / NA / NC |

Np Compliance with FPA and with the Rules:

- | | |
|--|-----------------|
| 23. Was the harvest in compliance with the approved application? | Y / N / NA / NC |
| 24. Was the harvest in compliance with the rules? | Y / N / NA / NC |

Ns Compliance with FPA with the Rules:

Y / N / NA / NC

Y / N / NA / NC

Comments and field observations (reasons for any out of compliance calls, tree counts, etc)

Signature_____ **Date**_____

This page left intentionally blank

Eastern Washington Form #8

Type A or B WMZ and Forested Wetlands

FPA # _____ Date: _____

Y= Yes, N=No, NA = Not applicable, NC =No consensus (Defer to FPF)

1. Were the wetlands typed and sized appropriately on the ground, and consistent with the FPA? (If no, explain in comment section of this form.) Y / N / NA / NC
2. Is the variable buffer width appropriate relative to the WMZ table in WAC 222-30-020 (7) (a)? Y / N / NA / NC
3. Where operations were conducted within the WMZ, were the resulting openings less than 100 feet wide? (*as measured parallel to wetland edge*)
(If no, explain in comment section.) Y / N / NA / NC
4. Where operations were conducted within the WMZ, were the resulting openings no closer than 200 feet from each other? (*as measured parallel to wetland edge*)
(If no, explain in comment section.) Y / N / NA / NC

Type A Wetlands:

5. Are the leave trees in the WMZ representative of species found in the pre-harvest condition of the WMZ? (*evaluate stumps*) Y / N / NA / NC
6. Were any ground based harvesting systems used within the minimum WMZ without written approval of the Department? Y / N / NA / NC
7. When WMZs overlap an RMZ, was the requirement which best protects the public resource applied? Y / N / NA / NC
8. If any timber was felled into or cable yarded across Type A or B Wetlands, was there written approval of the Department? Y / N / NA / NC

Answer questions 9-11 if less than 10% of the harvest is within the WMZ.

9. Within the WMZ, are there at least 75 TPA greater than 4 inches dbh left? Y / N / NA / NC
10. Of the 75 TPA in the WMZ, are at least 25 of these greater than 12 inches dbh, where they exist? Y / N / NA / NC
11. Of the 25 TPA in the WMZ that are greater than 12 inches dbh, are at least 5 of these greater than 20 inches dbh where they exist? Y / N / NA / NC

Continue to next page, P 1/4

Eastern Washington Form #8 (Cont'd)

Answer 12 if more than 10% of the unit is within a WMZ.

12. Answer the following: Y / N / NA / NC
- a. Is 10% of the unit within a WMZ?
If yes go to b.
If no you are done with this question
 - b. Is the harvest unit a clear-cut less than 30 acres?
If yes, go to d
If no, go to c
 - c. Is the harvest unit is a partial cut less than 80 acres?
If yes, go to d
If no, you are done with this question
 - d. Did the Landowner leave 38 TPA in the WMZ greater than 4 inches dbh, 13 of which are greater than 12 inches dbh, including 3 trees 20 inches dbh where they exist.

Type B Wetlands:

13. Are the leave trees in the WMZ representative of species found in the pre-harvest condition of the WMZ area (*evaluate stumps*)? Y / N / NA / NC
14. Were any ground based harvesting systems used within the minimum WMZ without written approval of the Department? Y / N / NA / NC
15. When WMZs overlap an RMZ, was the requirement which best protects the public Resource applied? Y / N / NA / NC
16. If any timber was felled into or cable yarded across Type A or B Wetlands, was there written approval of the Department? Y / N / NA / NC

Answer questions 17-19 if less than 10% of the harvest is within the WMZ.

17. Within the WMZ, are there at least 75 TPA greater than 4 inches dbh? Y / N / NA / NC
18. Of the 75 TPA in the WMZ, are at least 25 of these greater than 12 inches dbh, where they exist? Y / N / NA / NC
19. Of the 25 TPA in the WMZ that are greater than 12 inches dbh, are at least 5 of these greater than 20 inches dbh where they exist? Y / N / NA / NC

Continue to next page, P 2/4

Eastern Washington Form #8 (Cont'd)

Answer 20 if more than 10% of the unit is within a WMZ.

20. Answer the following:

Y / N / NA / NC

- a. Is 10% of the unit within a WMZ?
If yes go to b.
If no you are done with this question
- b. Is the harvest unit a clear-cut less than 30 acres?
If yes, go to d
If no, go to c
- c. Is the harvest unit is a partial cut less than 80 acres?
If yes, go to d
If no, you are done with this question
- d. Did the Landowner leave 38 trees per acre in the WMZ greater than 6 inches dbh, 13 of which are greater than 12 inches dbh, including 3 trees 20 inches dbh where they exist?

Forested Wetland:

- 21. If harvest occurred within forested wetlands, then was the harvest method limited to low impact harvest or cable systems? Y / N / NA / NC
- 22. If a forested wetland exists within the boundaries of a harvest unit and the area of the wetland is greater than 3 acres, were the approximate boundaries delineated by the applicant? Y / N / NA / NC

Type A Wetland Compliance with FPA and with the Rules:

- 23. Was the harvest in compliance with the approved application? Y / N / NA / NC
- 24. Was the harvest in compliance with the rules? Y / N / NA / NC

Type B Wetland Compliance with FPA and with the Rules:

- 25. Was the harvest in compliance with the approved application? Y / N / NA / NC
- 26. Was the harvest in compliance with the rules? Y / N / NA / NC

Forested Wetland Compliance with FPA and with the Rules:

- 27. Was the harvest in compliance with the approved application? Y / N / NA / NC
- 28. Was the harvest in compliance with the rules? Y / N / NA / NC

Continue to next page, P 3/4

[illegible]

Supplemental Water Information Form 2010

FPA # Date

1. Was there any water that appeared to be incorrectly typed on the FPA? Y N NC IND (If YES, NC or IND to question 1, explain in comments and fill out appropriate section below.)
2. Was water type indicated on FPA different than that on the DNR hydro layer? Y N (If yes to question 2, explain: FPA water type_____; DNR hydro layer water type_____)
3. Was documentation that the applicant verified water types included with the FPA? Y N (If yes to question 3, check all that apply: WTCW___, WTMF___, Protocol Survey___, Other___)
4. Were physicals used to characterize water types in the above documentation (if any) accurate (e.g. BFW, gradient, basin size, barriers, channel connectivity, etc.)? Y N NA NC IND (If NO, NC or IND to question 4, explain in comments, and fill out appropriate section below.)
5. Was there a stream indicated on FPA that did not exist on the ground? Y N NC IND (If YES, what was the water type on the FPA? _____)
6. Was there a stream found on the ground that was not indicated on FPA? Y N NC IND (If YES, what was the apparent water type for the stream? _____)
7. Was the stream size consistent with that reported on the FPA? Y N NA NC IND
8. If NO, NC or IND to question 7, would the discrepancy affect buffer width? Y N NC IND
9. Were there stream associated wetlands that were not included in the stream buffer determination? (If yes, what was the stream type? _____) Y N NC IND
10. Was there a CMZ that was not reported on the FPA? Y N NA NC IND

11. Type S/F vs. Type N: Check all that apply

- ___ BFW indicated on FPA was different than that observed (FPA width____; Found width____)
- ___ Gradient from FPA was different than that observed (FPA gradient____; Found gradient____)
- ___ Basin size appeared to be the default physical used, and appeared to be inaccurate (BFW and gradient both met Type F physicals, but box still checked on WTCW)
- ___ Fish passage barrier was not described accurately
- ___ Type break placed at temporary barrier (logjam, etc.) or man-made barrier (culvert, etc.)
- ___ Dry reach or stream inappropriately treated as Type N
- ___ Fish observed in water described by applicant as non-fish water
- ___ Pond or wetland with ponded water >1/2 acre not treated as Type F, absent protocol survey
- ___ Water labeled other than Type F appeared to meet Type F physicals (describe in comments)

12. Type Np vs. Type Ns: Check all that apply

- ___ Stream described as Ns appeared to be Np, or vice versa (explain in comments)
- ___ PIP/UMPPF location appeared to be incorrect (on FPA___; on ground___)

Supplemental Water Information Form 2010 continued

13. Type Ns vs. untyped water: Check all that apply

- ☐ Applicant stated that channel does not connect to higher order water, but in fact it does
☐ Stream indicated as Ns on FPA did not actually connect to higher order water

14. Wetlands: Check all that apply

- ☐ Wetland appeared to be typed incorrectly (explain in comments)
☐ Wetland appeared to meet default physical criteria for Type F water (describe in comments)
☐ Wetland was stream-associated with a typed stream (If so, what was stream type? _____)
☐ Wetland size was not accurately described on FPA
☐ Wetland found on the ground that was not indicated on FPA
☐ Wetland indicated on FPA that was not found on the ground

Comments:

Signatures of participants

Ecology _____
WDFW _____
DNR _____
Tribes (specify) _____
Other(s) _____

(jrh 8.20.09)